

REMARKS

The Official Action of November 24, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain claims 1-6, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the Abstract, Applicant has enclosed a new abstract for that originally filed, amended to eliminate legal phraseology as required by the Examiner.

Applicant has further enclosed a new Fig. 1 for that originally filed, amended to indicate that it depicts "Prior Art".

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the abstract has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redman '988 in view of Elliot '316, and claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redman in view of Elliot further in view of Hagler '214. Applicant respectfully traverses both of these rejections as applied to the claims as amended.

The pump disclosed in Redman '988 differs from the claimed pump in that it does not teach the following limitations set out in amended claim 1:

*"...said cylinders being provided within a single block formed as a unit together with said conduits and said manifolds,..."*

In Fig. 1 of Redman, it is evident that the cylinder is, at least in part, provided in the block 14, the valves are provided in blocks 27, 28 and the delivery and intake manifolds are provided in blocks 22, 23. An intermediate block 10 is also provided with conduits 19, 20, conduit 19 forming part of the cylinder. The Elliott cylinders are also not provided within a single block formed as a unit. Block 20 of Elliott provides only for a small part of the cylinder, while also block 10 and "power frame" 12 are needed.

Applicant further submits that the Elliott "cylinders" 50, 32 are in fact seat retainers for the valves, not seats for the plunger as indicated by the Examiner on page 3 line 15 of his Office Action.

One of the problems to be solved by the invention is recited at page 2 of the specification:

*"A first problem is the constructional complication which for each cylinder requires the formation of two valve containing compartments communicating with the outside, and the provision of the relative sealed plugs."*

The solution to this problem is recited in the first paragraph on page 4 of the specification:

*"Said object is attained, according to the invention, by forming the compartment containing the intake valve as an extension of the respective cylinder, and communicating with an intake manifold positioned in front of the cylinder head."*

Applicant respectfully submits that the above feature is not disclosed in either Redman or Elliott. Accordingly, the combination of these documents does not lead the skilled man to the claimed invention.

Starting from Redman as the nearest prior art, Applicant submits that there is no suggestion given by the prior art pump shown in Fig. 1 of the patent application to modify the pump of Redman according to the invention. Locating in a single block all the features of Redman does not avoid the problem of the second closure member.

The combination of Redman and Elliott also does not lead to the claimed invention as Elliott does not teach cylinders as seats for the respective plungers being provided within a single block formed as a unit together with the conduits to the manifolds.

Also, in Elliott the pump end includes essential elements, namely seat retainers 50 and 70 which holds both valves. The Elliott retainer 70 also receives the threaded

closure element 76. The seat retainers 50, 70 are held in place by alignment plugs 72 and 54 which are absent in the claimed unit of the invention.

Applicant further submits that the combination of Redman and Elliott and prior art Fig. 1 of the patent application does not lead to the invention as Elliott teaches holding the valves by means of the seat retainers 70 and 50 which are essential to the skilled artisan to keep the valves in place.

Applicant submits that there is no motivation or incentive for any of the prior art combinations either cited by the Examiner or suggested by Applicant. Simply combining the single block of Elliott with the Redman combination does not lead to the claimed invention, as the combination does not teach that the intake manifold is positioned in front of the line of cylinders.

In Elliott, the two valves must be aligned for assembly reasons. Accordingly, the skilled artisan would not think to locate the intake manifold in the plane of the cylinder axes.

Further, using parts 23, 28, 29 and 10 of Redman would prevent the assembly of the exhaust valve.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that


Appln. No. 10/777,627  
Amdt. dated February 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 24, 2006

such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently  
pertinent to warrant their applications against any of  
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are  
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\C\Corr\Fabbri4\Pto\2007-02-21 Amendment.doc